DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 857 CS 205 348

AUTHOR Holladay, Sylvia A.
TITLE Final Report of the Committee on Uniform Course Numbering Systems.
INSTITUTION Conference on Coll. Composition and Communication, Urbana, Ill.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum; Composition (Literary); Cooperative Programs; Course Content; *Educational Administration; Educational Research; *English Curriculum; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *School Surveys; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Uniform Course Numbering

ABSTRACT

This report is the result of a three-year survey of uniform course numbering systems across the nation, conducted by a committee created by the Conference on College Composition and Communication. It describes the establishment of the committee and then provides an overview of the responses to the survey from the 50 states. This is followed by an examination of the systems in some specific states and includes such information as how long the system has been in effect, who originated the system, who controls it, what the range and scope of the system is, what its purpose is seen to be, opinions about some specific systems, a listing of the advantages and disadvantages of the individual systems, their effects, and what future is seen for them. In addition, evaluative comments about the systems from individuals from several states are included. (TJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED181457

FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM COURSE NUMBERING SYSTEMS

Sylvia A. Holladay
Chair
Committee on Uniform Course Numbering Systems

November 1979

Conference on College Composition and Communication
Urbana, Illinois

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sylvia A. Holladay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

C SD5 3K8

To: Executive Committee, Conference on College Composition and Communication

From: Sylvia A. Holladay, Chair, Committee on Uniform Course Numbering Systems

Date: November 1979

Subject: Final Report of the Committee on Uniform Course Numbering Systems

In 1975 English teachers in colleges and universities across the nation became concerned over the imposition of uniform course numbering (UCN) systems in schools of higher education. Several state legislatures and departments of education were interested in such systems to facilitate transfer of students and to save money through the use of one statewide computer system for records. As interest grew, some English teachers became more concerned about the possible effects of such systems (that is, possible restrictions on curricular development, on methods of instruction, and on textbook selection, possible outside control of course content, possible censorship, threats to academic freedom, and the impact upon allocation of funds). At the same time, other English teachers were asking, "What is a uniform course numbering system?"

At the Annual Business Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) in 1975, this matter was brought before the membership, and it was decided that CCCC should monitor the established UCN systems as well as the proposals for new systems and report the findings. Thus, CCCC passed the following resolution expressing concern over uniform course numbering systems:

> Whereas several state departments of education and/or legislatures are considering the imposition of a common course numbering system upon the curricula of all colleges and universities within those states; and

CCCC Officers
Frank J. D'Angelo, Chair
Arizona State University
Lynn Quitman Troyka, Associate Chair
Queensborough Community College–CUNY
James Lee Hill, Assistant Chair
Albany State College
Richard Gebhardt, Secretary
Findlay College
Robert F. Hogan
Executive Director of NCTE
Richard L. Larson, Editor
Herbert H. Lehman College–CUNY

Executive Committee
Kathleen Proia Amar (1980)
Strayer College
Betty Bamberg (1982)
University of Southern California
Lynn Z. Bloom (1982)
College of William and Mary
John P. Bodnar (1980)
Prince George's Community College
Dolores L. Bowyer (1981)
Phoenix College
Robert C. Brown (1982)
Oscar Rose Junior College
Paul T. Bryant (1980)
Colorado State University
Miriam T. Chaplin (1982)
Rutgers University
William W. Cook (1981)
Dartmouth College
Vivian Davis (1981)
Dallas, Texas
William C. Doster (1981)
College of DuPage
Roger D. Eason (1981)
State Technical Institute at Memphis
Bernard F. Engel (1980)
Michigan State University
Roseann Duenas Gonzalez (1980)
University of Arizona
Kris D. Gutierrez (1981)
University of Colorado
Maxine Hairston (1981)
University of Texas–Austin
Mildred A. Hill-Lubin (1980)
University of Florida
Bert Hitchcock (1980)
Auburn University
Sylvia A. Holladay (1981)
St. Petersburg Junior College
Pinkie Gordon Lane (1982)
Southern University
Janice M. Lauer (1981)
University of Detroit–Marygrove College
Delores Lipscomb (1982)
Chicago State University
Andrea A. Lunsford (1982)
University of British Columbia
Donald McQuade (1980)
Queens College–CUNY
William Monday (1980)
Mount Royal College
Lee Odell (1981)
SUNY–Albany
Rosentene Bennett Purnell (1980)
California State University–Northridge
Phyllis A. Sherwood (1981)
Raymond Walters College

Immediate Past Chair
William F. Irmscher
University of Washington

Representative to NCTE College Section
Marianne Davis
Benedict College

NCTE
National Council of Teachers of English
1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801

Whereas the implementation of a common course numbering system might have serious consequences for academic departments and their curricula (for example, course content, textbook selection, and allocation of resources);
Be it resolved that CCCC express its concern about legislated common course numbering systems for all colleges and universities within a state by requesting that the Executive Committee appoint a special committee to study the advantages and disadvantages of common course numbering systems and to present its findings at or before the next annual meeting of CCCC.

In 1976 Marianna Davis, Chair of the Executive Committee of CCCC, appointed an ad hoc committee to enact the 1975 resolution. Sylvia A. Holladay (St. Petersburg Junior College) was appointed chair of this committee, with Fred Standley (Florida State University) and Roseann Duenas Gonzalez (University of Arizona) as committee members. The committee was empowered to investigate existing and proposed uniform course numbering systems (their purpose, scope, administration, and operation) and to study their effects (implications, advantages, and disadvantages). The specific charge to the committee was:

1) to gather and monitor information about UCN systems across the nation;
2) to prepare periodic written reports to keep the CCCC Executive Committee informed of the progress of the study;
3) when sufficient data has been collected, prepare a final written evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of UCN systems to be presented to the Executive Committee, which will decide what action should then be taken.

The three-year study of uniform course numbering systems is now complete. The committee did not attempt to conduct a statistically valid sampling, but in keeping with the instructions from the CCCC Executive Committee, the UCN Committee has gathered basic information and varied opinions on UCN systems. In each state in which UCN is in operation or under discussion, English professors and education professors, administrators and registrators from various types of schools, as well as officials of the state department of education were surveyed.

The responses to the surveys indicate that:

1) Eight states--Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, and Virginia--now have some form of uniform course numbering system for higher education in effect.
2) One state, Arizona, will implement a UCN system for freshman composition courses in 1980.
3) Two states, Maine and Texas, probably will establish UCN within the public university and two-year college system soon.
4) Five states--California, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, Montana--have discussed UCN, but have decided not to establish a uniform system of numbering. Kentucky instead has developed articulation agreements and a transfer guide to facilitate transfer.

5) Two states, Kansas and South Carolina, use the Hegis code to ease transfer of courses among the schools.
6) The remaining thirty-two states do not have UCN, and no discussion has been reported to the committee. These states are Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The statewide uniform course numbering systems now in effect differ greatly. The Oregon system applies only to freshman composition courses among state colleges, universities, and community colleges; and opinions are generally favorable. (This is the type of UCN system proposed for Arizona.) Three states--Alabama, Mississippi, and Virginia--have restricted the UCN scope to courses in two-year colleges in order to ease transfer to state universities, and the responses of those persons surveyed are favorable. Three states--Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Utah--have uniform broad categories of numbers to indicate levels (i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior) of courses in the public two-year colleges and universities, and the responses are favorable. The system in Florida is the most comprehensive and has evoked the strongest and most divergent reactions. In effect since 1977, this system mandates uniform course numbers and course profiles for all courses in public two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities; it will soon be expanded to include all postsecondary vocational centers and schools. A 1975 Florida law provides the safeguard that "the system shall not encourage or require course content prescription or standardization or uniform course testing." Generally the Florida DOE officials view this system favorably, especially its improving communications, evaluating curriculum, and identifying problem areas for action; but the English faculty consider its effects detrimental to curricular development, academic freedom, and funding.

Because the UCN systems now in effect are so different and because our sampling of opinion has been relatively small, the committee has found it difficult to draw conclusions as to the advantages and disadvantages of uniform course numbering. Nevertheless, the major results of the survey responses follow. The major advantages are: 1) ease of transfer of students among colleges and universities within the system; 2) improved articulation among colleges and universities within the system; 3) increased communication among schools within the system. The major disadvantages are: 1) increased paper work and bureaucracy to implement the system; 2) decreased curricular development and decision-making by individual schools within the system; 3) granting credit for courses with the same number but different content among the schools in the system. The uniformity or standardization of courses and programs among the schools within a system is viewed favorably by some respondents, but unfavorably by others.

The conclusions of the Uniform Course Numbering Committee are:

1) Interest in UCN systems has not increased much in the last three years and does not seem to be increasing greatly now.
2) The Florida system remains the most comprehensive and the most controversial system.
3) Many English faculty members are still uninformed and confused about UCN.
4) Of those English faculty informed, opinions vary greatly, with little pattern of opinion discernible. Generally, the broader the scope and the more complex the system, the more dissatisfaction and concern.
5) Statewide exit competencies and examinations--not uniform course numbering or uniform course descriptions--now seem to be the primary accountability demand. Tennessee now has performance funding for colleges and universities, Florida has mandated exit competencies and competency exams in communication and computational skills, and California is developing a statewide grading system and proficiency testing.
6) The UCN Committee endorses the work of the CCCC Testing Committee, and supports its monitoring and keeping the CCCC membership informed on competency laws and mandates for statewide proficiency testing.

SAH/79

FINAL REPORT ON UNIFORM COURSE NUMBERING SYSTEMS

Prepared by Sylvia A. Holladay, November 1979

CCCC Committee: Sylvia A. Holladay, Chair
Roseann Duenas Gonzalez
Fred Standley

No UCN and No Discussion: 4 states

Connecticut
Iowa
Kentucky
Missouri

Comments:

Kentucky: "Approximately three years ago there was some concern generated within the state regarding the need for uniform course numbering. The Council appointed an ad hoc committee to identify the problem and to propose solutions to it. This committee was composed of institutional representatives as well as representatives from educational groups, the state Department of Education, and the state's postsecondary vocational-technical school system. Their conclusion was that a uniform course numbering system implemented in the state of Kentucky would be of little benefit in solving the few problems experienced by students in transferring from one institution to another. Their solution was that a study group on student transferability should be appointed. This committee was appointed to study the problem of transferability between and among Kentucky's institutions of higher education. Five recommendations were forthcoming from this committee although two of the recommendations seemed to be of most importance. One was that institutions should develop articulation agreements so that students might transfer without major problems and that the students would know what courses would transfer and what courses would not transfer prior to their enrolling in the transferring institution. The second recommendation was that a transfer guide be developed by the Council outlining and detailing the transfer policies of the various institutions."

Ted R. Morford
Deputy Executive Director
for Academic Affairs
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Council for Higher Education

Kentucky: "Though the question/problem has been raised, no actions have been taken except to redirect it for further study. All interest seems to have come from registrars and administrators."

Alfred L. Crabb
Assistant Chairman
Department of English
University of Kentucky

Connecticut: "The work involved would be out of proportion to the purported benefits. We have all we can handle to keep an accurate inventory of 'approved' programs in the state numbering approximately 1800."

Donald H. Winandy, Coordinator
Office of Planning & Academic Affairs
Connecticut Board of Higher Education

"I don't see much value in UCN--nor do any of my colleagues on our writing committee. We hope we don't hear any more about it."

Donald Gallo
Professor of English
Central Connecticut State College

UCN Under Discussion: 3 states

Maine - Planning stage; mixed responses; probable implementation for state university system

Montana - Mixed responses; doubtful implementation in state university system

Texas - Mixed responses; probable implementation for all colleges and universities

Hegis Code in Effect: 2 states

Kansas - Partial scope: 6 public universities; favorable responses

South Carolina - Partial scope: 16 technical colleges; favorable responses

Comments:

South Carolina: "The 16 state technical colleges use the HEGIS Discipline Code, but the state has also devised a uniform system through a statewide-managed catalog of approved courses with common course numbers, titles, and credit hours within the HEGIS System. There is also a catalog of course descriptions for courses in the catalog of approved courses. Courses within each discipline are reviewed periodically by statewide groups of department chairs. The catalog of approved courses and HEGIS Coding System are the basis for funding within the South Carolina Technical Education System."

Tom Waldrep
Midlands Technical College

Variations of UCN Now in Effect: 8 states (variable scope)

UCN for Two-Year Colleges: 3 states

Alabama - Favorable responses
Status: In effect 3 years
Origin: Alabama Department of Education (DOE)
Control: Department of Education
Scope: All courses in all public two-year colleges
Range: Uniform numbers and titles
Purpose: To facilitate articulation
To ease transfer
Opinions: All favorable
Advantages: Better articulation
Ease of transfer
Increased uniformity of courses
Disadvantages: Increased paper work
Difficulty in assigning numbers to courses
Decreased individual school decision-making
Effects: Beneficial
Projection: To be expanded (how, not explained)

Comments: "A uniform numbering system for all 21 junior colleges in Alabama facilitates student transfer among the junior colleges and other institutions of higher learning."

Tommy Boothe
Department of Education

"Makes articulation and transfer to 4-year institutions much easier."

Maxine Mashburn
Gadsden State Junior College

Mississippi - Favorable responses

Status: In effect since 1972
Origin: Combination of college administrators, college registrars, and Department of Education
Control: Shared by college administrators and Department of Education
Scope: All courses in all public two-year colleges
Range: Uniform numbers, titles, and course descriptions
Purpose: To facilitate articulation
To make courses uniform in content
To make programs uniform
Opinions: All favorable
Advantages: Ease of transfer
Better articulation
Increased communication among schools
Disadvantages: None
Effects: Beneficial
Projection: To be expanded to all colleges and universities

Comments: "The Mississippi four-year schools do not subscribe to UCN, but the two-year colleges do. (Except for the Jones Junior College District, which operates on the quarter system while the rest of the junior college districts are on semesters.)"

"The uniform system of identifying courses in all Mississippi college parallel curriculums was adopted in 1971 and implemented in the fourteen public junior college districts in 1972-73. The system is simple and clear. A general revision of the system is done each five years. New courses are constantly reviewed by a screening committee. When a new course is added, the name, description, and course number are furnished to all senior and junior institutions in an addendum."

From a state publication

Virginia - Favorable responses

Status: In effect since 1978
Origin: State Board for Community Colleges and the Chancellor
Scope: All courses in all 23 community colleges
Range: Course identification and description; course review and approval; curricular design for degree programs, specialized programs, standardized procedures relating to credit courses

Purpose: To make courses uniform in content
To make programs uniform
To ease transfer
To facilitate articulation
Opinions: Mixed
Advantages: Ease of transfer
Better articulation
Increased uniformity of courses
Clarity of identification system
Disadvantages: Difficulty in assigning numbers to courses
Complex identification system
Effects: Unknown as of now
Projection: To continue as is

Comments: A uniform course numbering system has been established by the Systems Office (Academic and Student Affairs Division) for all courses approved by the Virginia Community College System (23 public community colleges). The State Curriculum Guide is updated each year. The Guide includes the statewide review and approval process; the common curricular design for degree programs, state and regional specialized programs; standardized procedures relating to credit courses; a complete listing of approved courses (numbers, titles, credit hours, and descriptions). The system itself is simple and clear. The procedures for requesting new or revised programs and courses are also uniform, and a supplementary booklet to explain current procedures is published.

From State Curriculum Guide

"There is some effort to maintain content similarity among the community colleges. The negative impact is the tremendous proliferation of course numbering as seen in the enclosed Curriculum Guide. The only way to revise a course sequence that really alters the credit hours or content is to request a new sequence. Otherwise, a major change in an existing sequence must be coordinated among all 23 community colleges in Virginia. Also, the common numbering system means that the process to have a new course approved is lengthy although it does not require approval of other colleges or the state office. The greatest benefit is the ease students experience going from one community college to another within the state. If the system improves transferability the effort may be worthwhile. However, if students have problems transferring within the state because courses don't

match up, then it would not be worth the effort, nor the potential negative impact on the educational programs within the community colleges and the universities."

-- Dr. Arnold Oliver
Northern Virginia Community College

Comprehensive UCN: 5 states

Oklahoma - Confused responses
3 faculty members - no UCN now
Department of Education - UCN in effect now

Note: The following information is from Dr. Dan S. Hobbs, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

Status: In effect 5 years
Origin: Oklahoma State Regents for High Education
Control: Regents
Scope: Comprehensive - All courses in all public two-year colleges and universities
Range: Uniform definitions of course number meanings: The Oklahoma system uses a 4-digit code: the first digit gives the class level (FR, SOPH, etc.), the second and third digits give the sequence within academic departments of disciplines, and the fourth digit gives the number of semester hours offered.
Purpose: To facilitate articulation
To ease transfer
Opinions: Favorable
Advantages: Ease of transfer
Better articulation
Clarity of identification system
Disadvantages: None
Effects: Beneficial
Projection: To remain same

Comments: "Fine, but not perfect."

-- Dr. Dan S. Hobbs

"I'm still confused (as are our State Regents who started it in the first place), but I can accept it on some levels (or types of courses) if it is determined with benefit of faculty input."

-- Dr. Robert C. Brown
Oscar Rose Junior College

Anticipated Advantages: Ease of transfer
Better articulation
Clarity in identification system
Anticipated Disadvantages: Granting credit for courses with same number but different content
Increased uniformity of courses
Difficulty in assigning numbers to identify courses
Decreased individual school decision-making

Oregon - Mixed responses
Status: Since 1979, consistent course numbering for three-term freshman composition course among state colleges, universities, and community colleges, and fair consistency for lower-division literature surveys
Origin: State Board of Higher Education
Control: State Department of Higher Education
Scope: Comprehensive - identical numbers for level encouraged but not required
Range: Course level for academic and professional courses plus a distinctive numbering system for vocational-technical courses
Purpose: To facilitate articulation
To ease transfer
Opinions: Favorable
Advantages: Ease of transfer
Better articulation
Clarity of identification system
Disadvantages: Increased paper work
Decreased decision-making by individual schools
Effects: Beneficial
Projection: To remain same

Comments: "Our institutions use a uniform numbering system. We encourage but do not require that similar courses be identified with identical numbers--certainly not with identical titles. A copy of the Oregon State System of Higher Education course numbering system is enclosed. The Oregon community colleges number collegiate transfer courses with OSSHE numbers. Vocational-technical courses are numbered with a decimal point number, e.g., 5.621. Our primary concern is that courses be properly identified as to level."

-- Clarethel Kohananui
Assistant in Curriculum Planning
State Board of Higher Education

Comments: "I suppose the basic answer is NO, we don't have UCN in Oregon. We do, though, share such things as using the same broad categories for pre-lower division courses (1-99), then 100 and 200 courses are lower division, 300 and 400 are upper division, etc. But, ENG. 430, Renaissance Lit, at PSU isn't Renaissance Lit at the University of Oregon, etc.

"In the area of writing (composition) though there is some push for UCN. Among the 13 recommendations by our Ad Hoc Committee on Competencies in Composition is Number 6, 'Develop a consistent statewide system for numbering and credit for remedial courses.'

"That recommendation has been accepted by the state board and will get implemented in the near future, I guess. As far as UCN for the rest of the composition courses, that seems still to be left to the specific schools. In fact, the Ad Hoc Committee had recommended a state-wide freshman comp program and that was specifically turned down by the state board."

-- Anthony Wolk
Portland State University
(January 1978)

"For the past five years, I have been a member of a state-wide advisory committee on English composition. It took us 3 years to get consistent course numbering for the 3-term freshman composition course just among state colleges, universities, and community colleges. Now, WR 121, 122, and 123 are standard--both in course number and in content--among most, but not all, of these institutions; private colleges have their own numbering systems.

"There is fair consistency among these same schools for the numbering of most lower-division literature surveys: ENG 101-103 for the Survey of British Literature; ENG 104-106 or the Introduction to Fiction, Drama, and Poetry; ...."

-- F. Richard Friedman
Central Oregon Community College
(November 1979)

Utah - Favorable responses
Status: In effect 10 years
Origin: State Department of Education
Control: College administrators
Scope: Comprehensive for levels in public higher education

Range: Numbers only
Purpose: To make programs uniform
To ease transfer of students
Opinions: Favorable
Advantages: Ease of transfer
Clarity of identification system
Increased communication among schools
Disadvantages: Granting credit for courses with same number but different content
Effects: Mixed
Projection: To remain same

Comment: "The Utah UCN system is a very broad one:
100-199 = Freshman Courses
200-299 = Sophomore Courses
300-399 = Junior Courses
400-499 = Senior Courses
500-599 = Advanced Senior & Graduate
600-699 = Master's Work
700-799 = Doctoral Work
Groups within the levels are 'somewhat' standard (special projects, etc - 90's), but individual courses are not uniform (English 251 at USU is not the same number at Weber State). However, all General Education courses are accepted as transferable within the state system."
--K. B. Hunsaker
Utah State University

Arizona - Unfavorable responses
Status: Almost complete; probable implementation within a year
Origin: Junior colleges
Control: College English Administrators Association, state universities, and Board of Regents
Scope: Freshman composition only
Range: Uniform numbers and titles
Purpose: To ease transfer
To facilitate articulation
Opinions: Unfavorable
Conclusions: Oppressive; being forced to comply
Might help to solve ESL student problem
Projection: Junior level proficiency exam to be instituted soon

Florida - Most comprehensive; mixed responses
Status: In effect 3 years
Origin: Students, college administrators, and registrars suggested UCN for ease of transfer. Department of Education implemented it.

Control: Maintained by Department of Education with input from faculty discipline task forces

Scope: All courses in all public two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities (some prefixes and numbers for graduate courses, but courses not equated and not automatically transferable)

Range: Uniform course numbers and profiles to reflect common elements of comparable courses

Purpose: To save money
To facilitate articulation
To improve the quality of education
To increase communication among community colleges and universities
To ease transfer

Opinions: Students mixed: favorable for ease of transfer, but confusion over complex identification system devised by English task force
Faculty: unfavorable
Service personnel: unfavorable
Administrators: unfavorable
Department of Education: favorable

Advantages: More effective use of existing resources
Expectation of improved program planning
Ease of transfer
Better articulation
Increased communication among schools

Disadvantages: Nonequivalent courses (with the same number) at different schools; giving credit for courses with same number but different content--if discipline task force evaluated courses inadequately or inaccurately
Increased expense
Increased paper work
Increased bureaucracy
Impeding curriculum development
Confusion for students
Increased uniformity of courses
Difficulty in assigning numbers to courses
Complex system of letters and numbers to identify courses
Decreased academic freedom
Decreased individual university/college decision-making
Increased complexity of course designations (from one to 27 prefixes for English courses, from 2 to 3 letters, from 3 to 4 digits)
Nonsequential numbers for sequential courses (e.g., ENC 1103 for Composition I, and

ENC 1136, for Composition II, university-parallel courses; ENC 1312, Communications I, and ENC 1146, Communications II, first-year courses not intended to transfer)

The aura effect

Equivalent courses or course variations, e.g., honors sections, with different numbers

No cross listing of courses (e.g., all film courses with ENC prefix, no matter what department taught in)

Difficulties during transition period in transcript evaluation and advisement

Effects: Department of Education - beneficial
Faculty - detrimental

Projections: To be expanded to include all postsecondary vocational centers and schools
(Also see attached 1979 law on exit competencies.)

Summary: The Florida system is comprehensive, complex, confusing, and costly. It applies to all two-year and four-year colleges and universities, public and private, remedial (0000) through graduate (9000) courses. Common course numbers, uniform generic titles, and course profiles are used in the master inventory file.

Florida has been working on this system since 1962 when the Florida Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officer advocated a UCN project be started. In 1971 a statewide committee was appointed, and in 1973, 114 discipline task forces began to meet. During the planning from 1971 through 1977--before the system was implemented--the state spent more than a million dollars, not counting faculty time.

The 1975 law states:

The Commissioner of Education shall establish and coordinate a common course designation and numbering system for the community college and state university systems. The purpose of the common course designation and numbering system shall be to improve program planning, to increase communication among community colleges and universities, and to facilitate the transfer of students; provided, however, that the system shall not encourage or require course control prescription or standardization or uniform course testing, and provided further that the continuing maintenance of taxonomies shall be accomplished by appropriate faculty committees.

Thus, the stated purposes of the system are to improve communications between community colleges and universities, and to eliminate the problems and frustrations for the transferring student.

Comments: "Immensely reduced problems regarding identification of comparable courses. Improved counseling and program planning. A faculty developed data base to enhance curriculum review, development, and evaluation. Improved communications for the entire postsecondary education spectrum.

"Legislature has endorsed and funded statewide faculty conferences to enable faculty identification of problems revealed by the course numbering data base and to propose solutions.

"The course numbering system is a major step in improving communications, and in assisting faculty, institutional administrators, and agency personnel in identifying problem areas and taking appropriate action. Also, the recognition of this faculty developed data base by the Legislature will promote greater credibility and confidence in the reports prepared for their review."

-- William Cecil Golden
Associate Deputy Commissioner
of Education

"The beneficial effects have been:

Increased communication;
Identification of unwarranted overlapping and duplication between community colleges and universities;
Identification of lack of comparability of preparation of community college transfer students and lower division students;
Increased faculty awareness of articulation and curriculum problems.

"Course numbering is not viewed as a panacea but rather as a significant step in developing and maintaining an inventory of what is, what is alike, and what is different as perceived by faculty. Understanding of and appreciation for the system by faculty is improving rapidly. Also faculty have expressed considerable in-

terest in using the data for curriculum evaluation and planning."

-- Michael A. DeCarlo, Director
Department of Education
Statewide Course Numbering System

"It is costly and top-heavy, bureaucratically. It threatens academic freedom and course innovation. It continues to be a waste of time and money, but we apparently will have to live with it."

-- R. Bruce Bickley, FSU, Chair
Task Force for English

"To make courses uniform in content, I fear, may be the hidden agenda.

"I haven't seen any particular advantages or disadvantages beyond my having to learn new numbers and my persistent fears that UCN is but the first step in processes I won't like: e.g., attempts to mandate course objectives and content and examinations."

-- Dwight Burton, FSU
Professor of English Education

"More important than the direct monetary costs are the indirect intangible ones. Faculty treated like interchangeable parts will begin to act like interchangeable parts. They will be encouraged merely to put in their time, like assembly line workers. Their fear from all we have learned at the conference is that the uniform course designation and numbering system is designed neither for articulation nor to solve the problems of transfer students. It is designed as a management system to serve the purposes of management systems. It is designed to simplify program planning, budgeting and evaluation. But the cost to higher education will be enormous. It will in every instance work against quality and toward mediocrity and worse. It will reduce all to the lowest level.

"The content and description of courses, the number of meetings, the amount of course credit, the designation of the course (whether cross listed or not) seem to us an intra-institutional matter which must necessarily be left to the individual departments and their institutions.

"Uniform designation and numbering will require reductions of courses and course differences. These reductions will necessarily disregard faculty specialities, program differences, institutional differences, institutional provision for innovation.

"This system could lead to uniform use of texts and thus a single perspective, not the diversity of viewpoints essential to a democracy; uniform performance objectives or competency objectives on a state level; statewide, even nationwide testing.

"At the very least, the system will inevitably lead in every instance to a reduction qualitatively to the lowest common denomination. The institution or program or course that does the least and does it the cheapest will become the model. One cannot set requirements above the capacities of the least capable. All must be reduced to that.

"We believe the system to be academically unwise and dangerous and unworkable in practice. All efforts toward uniform designation and numbering are in effect efforts toward regimentation, standardization, inflexibility, impossible bureaucratic complexity. We find no positive values to the system."

-- English Task Force Report

TO: Respondents to Survey on Uniform Course Numbering Systems

FROM: Sylvia A. Holladay, Chair of UCN Committee

DATE: January 1980

The members of the Executive Committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communications, especially the ad hoc Committee on Uniform Course Numbering Systems, appreciate your assistance with our 1979 survey of statewide UCN systems in higher education. The information which you supplied helped us complete our task.

Enclosed is a copy of the summary report for your information.

Thank you for your cooperation with CCCC on this survey.